UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,622	11/30/2000	Jack Littleton	004423.P003	5421

7590 03/11/2004

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER	
BAYARD, DJENANE M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	5

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/729,622	Applicant(s) LITTLETON ET AL.	
	Examiner Djenane M Bayard	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 November 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2,4*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,884,323 to Hawkins et al.

a. As per claim 18, Hawkins et al teaches a machine-readable medium that provides instructions, which when executed by a processor, cause said processor to perform operations comprising: reading records of a first database on a handheld computer (See col. 7, lines 32-33); determining which records of said first database have been changed (See col. 7, lines 39-40); reading records of a second database maintained by a server (See col. 7, lines 42-44); determining which records of said second database have been changed (See col.7, lines 47-48); updating records of said second database to reflect changes made to records of said first database; and updating records of said first database to reflect changes made to records of said second database (See col. 7, lines 53-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,323 to Hawkins et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,078 to Menelli et al.

a. As per claim 1, Hawkins et al teaches a system comprising: a handheld computer including a first application program to maintain a first database (See col. 4, lines 24-41); and a host computer system including a synchronization program to provide a synchronization of information on said first database and information on a second database maintained by a server (See col. 4, lines 35-45). However, Hawkins et al fails to teach a second application program to enable a user to access said first database and change records in said first database according to features selected by the user.

Menelli et al teaches a user selectable parameters to enable a user to access database and change records in said database according to features selected by the user (See col. 2, lines 6-10)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a second application program to enable a user to access said first database and change records in said first database according to features selected by the user as taught by Menelli et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to incorporate new user friendly features into their wireless devices (See col. 1, lines 19-20).

b. As per claim 9, Hawkins et al teaches A method comprising: providing a first application program on a handheld computer to maintain a first database; (See col. 4, lines 24-41); and using a host computer system to synchronize information on said handheld computer with information maintained by a server (See col. 4, lines 35-45). However, Hawkins et al fails to teach providing a second application program on a handheld computer to enable a user to access said first database and change records in said first database according to features selected by the user.

Menelli et al teaches a user selectable parameters to enable a user to access database and change records in said database according to features selected by the user (See col. 2, lines 6-10)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a second application program to enable a user to access said first database and change records in said first database according to features selected by the user as taught by Menelli et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to incorporate new user friendly features into their wireless devices (See col. 1, lines 19-20).

c. As per claim 10, Hawkins et al teaches wherein said using a host computer to synchronize information further comprises: reading records of said first database from said handheld computer (See col. 7, lines 32-33); determining which records of said first database have been modified (See col. 7, lines 39-40); reading modified records of a second database maintained by a server (See col. 7, lines 42-44); updating records of said second database to reflect changes made to said modified records of said first database (See col. 7, lines 42-44); and updating records of said first database to reflect changes made to said modified records of said second database (See col. 7, lines 53-55).

5. Claims 2-3, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,323 to Hawkins et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,078 to Menelli et al as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,238 to Chase, Jr.

a. As per claim 2,11 Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al fails to teach wherein said synchronization program maintains a map file of checksum values to determine which records are new and which records have changed since previous synchronization.

Chase, Jr. teaches an automatic data synchronization between a handheld computer and a host computer using pseudo cache including tags and logical elements. Furthermore, Chase, Jr. teaches wherein said synchronization program maintains a map file of checksum values to determine which records are new and which records have changed since previous synchronization (See col. 13, lines 9-16).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said synchronization program maintains a map file of checksum values to determine which records are new and which records have changed since previous synchronization as taught by Chase, Jr. in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to allow the synchronization routine to detect record changes (See col. 13, lines 8-9).

b. As per claims 3, 12 Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins fails to teach wherein said synchronization program is configured to update

dirty flags maintained by said first application program to reflect changes made during synchronization between said handheld computer and said server.

Chase, Jr. teaches wherein said synchronization program is configured to update dirty flags maintained by said first application program to reflect changes made during synchronization between said handheld computer and said server (See col. 13, lines 31-67).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said synchronization program is configured to update dirty flags maintained by said first application program to reflect changes made during synchronization between said handheld computer and said server as taught by Chase, Jr. in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to achieve dynamic data synchronization (See col. 13, lines 50-51).

6. Claims 4-8, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,323 to Hawkins et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,078 to Menelli et al as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,108 to Goyal et al.

a. As per claims 4 and 13, Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al fails to teach wherein said handheld computer is a personal digital assistant.

Goyal et al teaches wherein said handheld computer is a personal digital assistant (See col. 3, lines 51-52).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said handheld computer is a personal digital assistant as taught by Chase, Jr. in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al because personal computing devices of handheld devices can be of various description including PDA (See col. 3, lines 58-60).

b. As per claims 5 and 14, Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al fails to teach wherein said first application program is a Personal Information Manager and said first database is an address book database.

Goyal et al teaches wherein said first application program is a Personal Information Manager and said first database is an address book database (See col. 1, lines 12-15).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said first application program is a Personal Information Manager and said first database is an address book database as taught by Goyal et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to mimic the organization and interaction of familiar organizer (See col. 1, lines 37-39)

c. As per claim 6 and 15, Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins fails to teach wherein said second application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database.

Menelli et al teaches wherein said the application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database (See col. 2, lines 16-23).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said second application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database as taught by Menelli et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order new user friendly features into their wireless devices (See col. 1, lines 19-20).

d. As per claims 7 and 16, Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al fails to teach wherein said telephone service features selectable by a user includes at least one of call waiting, call forwarding, call blocking, caller ID block, distinctive ring and anonymous call reject.

Menelli et al teaches wherein said the application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database (See col. 2, lines 16-23).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said second application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database as taught by Menelli et al in the claimed

invention of Hawkins et al in order new user friendly features into their wireless devices (See col. 1, lines 19-20).

e. As per claim 8 and 17, Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al fails to teach wherein said host computer system further comprises a Personal Information Manager to maintain records in a second address book database.

Goyal et al teaches wherein said host computer system further comprises a Personal Information Manager to maintain records in a second address book database (See col. 1, lines 12-15).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate said host computer system further comprises a Personal Information Manager to maintain records in a second address book database (See col. 1, lines 37-39).

7. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,323 to Hawkins et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,238 to Chase, Jr.

a. As per claim 19-20 Hawkins et al the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al fails to teach wherein said synchronization program maintains a map file of checksum values to determine which records are new and which records have changed since previous synchronization.

Chase, Jr. teaches an automatic data synchronization between a handheld computer and a host computer using pseudo cache including tags and logical elements. Furthermore, Chase, Jr.

teaches wherein said synchronization program maintains a map file of checksum values to determine which records are new and which records have changed since previous synchronization (See col. 13, lines 9-16).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said synchronization program maintains a map file of checksum values to determine which records are new and which records have changed since previous synchronization as taught by Chase, Jr. in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to allow the synchronization routine to detect record changes (See col. 13, lines 8-9).

b. As per claim 21, Hawkins et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins fails to teach wherein said synchronization program is configured to update dirty flags maintained by said first application program to reflect changes made during synchronization between said handheld computer and said server.

Chase, Jr. teaches wherein said synchronization program is configured to update dirty flags maintained by said first application program to reflect changes made during synchronization between said handheld computer and said server (See col. 13, lines 31-67).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said synchronization program is configured to update dirty flags maintained by said first application program to reflect changes made during synchronization between said handheld computer and said server as taught by Chase, Jr. in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to achieve dynamic data synchronization (See col. 13, lines 50-51).

8. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,323 to Hawkins et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0047393 to Arner et al.

22. As per claim 22, Hawkins et al teaches a handheld computer comprising: a first application to maintain a first database; a second application to enable a user to access said first database and change a record in said first database according to features selected by the user (See col. 4, lines 24-41); However, Hawkins et al fails to teach a wireless communications link with a server, wherein said hand held computer is configured to communicate information associated with said features selected by the user to said server over said wireless communications link.

Arner et al teaches a wireless communications link with a server, wherein said hand held computer is configured to communicate information associated with said features selected by the user to said server over said wireless communications link (See page 7, paragraph [0051-0052]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a wireless communications link with a server, wherein said hand held computer is configured to communicate information associated with said features selected by the user to said server over said wireless communications link as taught by Arner et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to enable a user to execute and interact with a program (See page2, paragraph [0015]).

9. Claims 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,323 to Hawkins et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0047393 to

Arner et al as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,108 to Goyal et al.

a. As per claim 23, Hawkins et al in view of Arner teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al in view of Arner fails to teach wherein said first application is a Personal Information Manager and said first database is an address book database.

Goyal et al teaches wherein said first application program is a Personal Information Manager and said first database is an address book database (See col. 1, lines 12-15).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said first application program is a Personal Information Manager and said first database is an address book database as taught by Goyal et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order to mimic the organization and interaction of familiar organizer (See col. 1, lines 37-39)

b. As per claim 26, Hawkins et al in view of Arner teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al in view of Arner fails to teach wherein said handheld computer is a personal digital assistant.

Goyal et al teaches wherein said handheld computer is a personal digital assistant (See col. 3, lines 51-52).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said handheld computer is a personal digital assistant as taught

by Chase, Jr. in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al because personal computing devices of handheld devices can be of various description including PDA (See col. 3, lines 58-60).

10. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,323 to Hawkins et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0047393 to Arner et al as applied to claim 22 above, further in view of view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,108 to Goyal et al, and further in view of view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,078 to Menelli et al.

a. As per claim 24, Hawkins et al in view of Arner in view of Goyal et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al in view of Arner in view of Goyal et al fails to teach wherein said second application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database.

Menelli et al teaches wherein said the application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database (See col. 2, lines 16-23).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said second application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database as taught by Menelli et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order new user friendly features into their wireless devices (See col. 1, lines 19-20).

b. As per claim 25, Hawkins et al in view of Arner in view of Goyal et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Hawkins et al in view of Arner in view of Goyal fails to teach wherein said telephone service features selectable by a user includes at least one of call waiting, call forwarding, call blocking, caller ID block, distinctive ring and anonymous call reject.

Menelli et al teaches wherein said the application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database (See col. 2, lines 16-23).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein said second application program is a telephone management application program to enable a user to select telephone service features for those contacts that appear in the address book database as taught by Menelli et al in the claimed invention of Hawkins et al in order new user friendly features into their wireless devices (See col. 1, lines 19-20).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,574,859 to Yeh et al teaches a portable information storage and transfer device.

U.S. Patent No. 5,666,530 to Clark et al teaches a system for automatic synchronization of common file between portable computer via communication channel selected from a plurality of usable channels there between.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (703) 305-6606. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

LE HIEN LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER